

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-7 and 34 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,533,666, hereinafter Cromwell, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,678,391, hereinafter Andersen.

Claim 1 is amended to recite a method of folding a bottom of a package including pressing a middle of the sealed portion of the fin, thereby folding a middle portion of the fin. As illustrated in Figs. 3a and 3b of the application, plunger 8 moves so as to press on a middle of the sealed portion 33 of the fin 15. Fig. 5b of the application illustrates the fin 15 including sealed portion 33 before folding.

In this regard, Cromwell discloses flaps 70 and 78 which are folded by engagement with plates 150 and 154 as illustrated in Fig. 12. Furthermore, the Official Action asserts that the illustration in Fig. 3 of the folding of flaps 70 and 78 corresponds to folding a middle portion of a fin, and that Andersen teaches a step of sealing ends of a fin. Without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, even if flaps 70 and 78 of Cromwell were sealed together prior to folding to form a sealed portion of a fin, plates 150 and 154 are clearly not positioned such that they would press on a middle of a sealed portion of a fin.

Furthermore, Claim 1 is amended to recite a method of folding a bottom of a package including pressing knives against corners on a folded fin, thereby breaking the corners. As illustrated in Figs. 3a and 3b of the application, knives 7a move so as to press against and break corners of the folded fin. Fig. 5c of the application illustrates corners 32 of the folded fin after breaking. In this regard, neither Cromwell

nor Andersen disclose the use of knives to press against and break corners of a folded fin.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over Cromwell in view of Andersen, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 as being unpatentable over Cromwell in view of Andersen is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-7 and 34 are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

New dependent Claims 35 and 36 recite additional features which are patentably distinguishable over Cromwell and Andersen.

Withdrawal of the rejection of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 21, 2008

By: Peter T. deVore
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620